Application No. 10/808,994 Amendment Dated December 20, 2006 Reply to Office Action of November 20, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Entry of the foregoing amendment and reconsideration of this application are requested. Claims 1-23 and 26 have been cancelled, claims 24, 25, 27, and 28 have been amended, and claims 24, 25, 27 and 28 remain pending in the application.

The Examiner has indicated claims 25 and 28 are conditionally allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, amended claim 25 is the combination of previously submitted claims 23 and 25. Claim 24 now depends from amended claim 25. Amended claim 28 is the combination of previously submitted claims 26 and 28. Claim 27 now depends from amended claim 28.

It is noted that the Examiner in her Response to Arguments states that "Finally, Applicant argues that Peterson would only teach one skilled in the art to provide a snap fit or pressure fit between a handle and a broom. In response, this argument is misleading."

For the record, applicant was recalling a previous argument from an earlier amendment. It is submitted that applicant proceeds to address the combination of Peterson with Jacanin, Jr. and reasonably argues that this combination would result in the handle of the shovel being snap fit onto the blade, and not the snap fitting of two blades together. The Examiner may disagree with this argument, but it is not believed to be misleading, nor piecemeal in analysis.

It is now submitted that the claims as amended patentably define over the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to pass this application to issue with claims 24, 25, 27 and 28 being deemed allowable.

Application No. 10/808,994 Amendment Dated December 20, 2006 Reply to Office Action of November 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP

William L. Falk (Reg. No. 27,709)

100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100 Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202 (414) 271-7590